

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are now pending in the application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McCrady et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,487,936). In view of the amendments made to the claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

DOUBLE PATENTING

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1-39 of commonly owned U.S. Patent No. 6,766,889. Accordingly, Applicant has filed herewith a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R 1.32(c) to overcome this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1240.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2004

By:



Philip E. Rettig Reg. No. 34,000

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

PER/lkb